UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/006,552	12/04/2001	Patrick D. McDaniel	UOM 0244 PUS	2644

22045 7590 09/07/2005

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 TOWN CENTER
TWENTY-SECOND FLOOR
SOUTHFIELD, MI 48075

EXAMINER	
GELAGAY, SHEWAYE	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2133	

DATE MAILED: 09/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/006,552	MCDANIEL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Shewaye Gelagay	2133	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *13 June 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to Applicant's amendment filed on June 13, 2005. Claims 1-24 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments, see Remarks, filed June 13, 2005, have been considered but are not persuasive. In response to the arguments concerning the previously rejected claims, the following comments are made:

The Applicant argues, "there is no notion of access control policies" by Bahlmann (U.S. Patent 6, 487,594). The Examiner disagrees. Bahlmann discloses a Subscriber Management System (SMS) database that represents the repository of subscriber specific data including name, address, billing information, etc. This information is used as access control by prohibiting unauthorized access to confidential data. (Col. 6, lines 59-67 and Col. 7, lines 1-58)

The Applicant argues, "there is no support for provisioning of mechanisms in the policies" by Moriconi et al. (U.S. Patent 6,158,010). The Examiner disagrees. Moriconi et al. disclose a system comprising policy manager located on a server for managing and distributing a local client policy based on a global security policy. (Col. 4, lines 19-22) Furthermore, Moriconi et al. disclose a policy manager manages and distributes a policy, a policy that is intended to specify the security requirements for applications and databases. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies

(i.e., "reconfiguration of a policy when an operation is attempted") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

The Applicant argues "there is no support for reconciling group and local policies to determined a policy instance or checking compliance of a local policy with a policy instance". The Examiner disagrees. Bahlmann teaches a central database operable with each of the regional policy databases for providing central definitions to the Internet servers. (Col. 2, lines 10-12) The central definitions are equivalent to the group policy while regional policy is equivalent to local policies. Therefore, Bahlmann discloses reconciling group policy with local policy because the local management has to implement the centralized configuration that is provided by a central policy database (CPD). (Abstract)

The Applicant argues Bahlmann fails to show "a group policy" and "to distribute a policy instance which defines a configuration of security-related services used to implement the session". The Examiner disagrees. Bahlmann distributes a group policy for providing centralized configuration (See Abstract) and discloses a Subscriber Management System (SMS) database that represents information used to implement security-related services. (Col. 6, lines 59-67 and Col. 7, lines 1-58)

The Examiner disagrees with the applicant and maintains all rejections. All amendments and argument by the Applicant have been considered. It is the Examiner's conclusion that calms 1-24 are not patentably distinct or non-obvious over the prior art

of record in view of the references Bahlmann, Brownlie and Moriconi. Therefore, all the rejection is maintained as given below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 1-4, 8-11, 13-16 and 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bahlmann United States Letter Patent Number 6,487,594 further in view of Brownlie et al. (hereinafter Brownlie) United States Letter Patent Number 6,202,157.

As per claims 1 and 13:

Bahlmann teaches a method and system for determining and enforcing security policy in a communication session for a group of participants, the method comprising:

providing group and local policies wherein each local policy states a set of local requirements for the session for a participant and the group policy represents a set of conditional, security-relevant requirements to support the session; (Col. 1, lines 59-63; Col. 2, lines 64-65)

generating a policy instance based on the group and local policies wherein the policy instance defines a configuration of security-related services used to implement the session and rules used for authorization and access control of participants to the session; (Col. 2, lines 8-12 and lines 34-36)

distributing the policy instance to the participants; (Col. 1, lines 64-67; Col. 3, lines 50-53)

Bahlmann does not explicitly disclose analyzing the policy instance with respect to a set of correctness principles; and enforcing the security policy based on the rules throughout the session.

Brownlie in analogous art, however, discloses analyzing the policy instance with respect to a set of correctness principles; (Col. 5, lines 31-38) and enforcing the security policy based on the rules throughout the session (Col. 5, lines 46-48).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method and system disclosed by Bahlmann to include analyzing the policy instance with respect to a set of correctness

principles; and enforcing the security policy based on the rules throughout the session. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so, as suggested by, Brownlie (Abstract) in order to provide variable security policy rule data for distribution to network node through central security policy rule data distribution source and enforce the policy rules.

As per claims 2 and 14:

Bahlmann and Brownlie teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Brownlie further discloses a method and system wherein the step of distributing includes the steps of authorizing a potential participant to participate in the session based on the rules and determining whether the potential participant has a right to view the security policy. (Col. 7, lines 8-15)

As per claims 3 and 15:

Bahlmann and Brownlie teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Brownlie further discloses a method and system wherein the step of analyzing verifies that the policy instance adheres to a set of principles defining legal construction and composition of the security policy. (Col. 5, lines 33-37)

As per claims 4 and 16:

Bahlmann and Brownlie teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Bahlmann further discloses a method and system wherein the step of generating includes the step of reconciling the group and local policies to obtain the policy instance which is substantially compliant with each of the local policies and wherein the policy instance identifies relevant requirements of the session and how the

relevant requirements are mapped into the configuration. (Col. 2, lines 10-12; a central policy database operable with each of the regional policy databases for providing central definitions to the Internet servers.)

As per claims 8 and 20:

Bahlmann and Brownlie teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Brownlie further discloses a method and system wherein the step of enforcing includes the steps of creating and processing events and. (Col. 6, lines 33-55)

As per claims 9 and 21:

Bahlmann, Brownlie and Moriconi teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Brownlie further discloses a method and system wherein the step of enforcing includes delivering the events to security services via a real or software-emulated broadcast bus. (Col. 7, lines 58-64)

As per claims 10 and 22:

Bahlmann and Brownlie teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Brownlie further discloses a method and system wherein the step of creating events includes the step of translating application requests into the events. (Col. 6, lines 33-55)

As per claims 11 and 23:

Bahlmann and Brownlie teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Brownlie further discloses a method and system wherein the step of enforcing further includes the steps of creating and processing timers and messages. (Col. 7, lines 50-56)

5. Claims 5-7, 12, 17-19 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bahlmann United States Letter Patent Number 6,487,594 further in view of Brownlie et al. (hereinafter Brownlie) United States Letter Patent Number 6,202,157 and further in view of Moriconi et al. (hereinafter Moriconi) United States Patent Number 6,158,010.

As per claims 5 and 17:

Bahlmann and Brownlie teach all the subject matter as discussed above. Both references do not explicitly disclose a method and system comprising verifying that the policy instance complies with the set of local requirements stated in the local policies.

Moriconi in analogous art, however, discloses verifying that the policy instance complies with the set of local requirements stated in the local policies. (Col. 4, lines 20-24)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method and system disclosed by Bahlmann and Brownlie to include verifying that the policy instance complies with the set of local requirements stated in the local policies. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so, as suggested by, Moriconi (Col. 3, lines 44-45) in order to protect distributed networks of enterprises against unauthorized access.

As per claims 6 and 18:

Bahlmann, Brownlie and Moriconi teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Brownlie further discloses a method and system comprising

identifying parts of a local policy that are not compliant with the policy instance and determining modifications required to make the local policy compliant with the policy instance. (Col. 7, lines 41-49)

As per claims 7 and 19:

Bahlmann, Brownlie and Moriconi teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Brownlie further discloses a method and system comprising preventing a potential participant from participating in the session if the policy instance does not comply with the set of local requirements of the potential participant. (Col. 7, lines 12-14)

As per claims 12 and 24:

Bahlmann and Brownlie teach all the subject matter as discussed above. Both references do not explicitly disclose a method and system wherein the set of local requirements specifies provisioning and access control policies.

Moriconi in analogous art, however, discloses a set of local requirements specifies provisioning and access control policies. (Col. 4, lines 28-33)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method and system disclosed by Bahlmann and Brownlie to include a set of local requirements specifies provisioning and access control policies. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so, as suggested by, Moriconi (Abstract) in order to manage access to the securable components as specified by the local policy.

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shewaye Gelagay whose telephone number is 571-272-4219. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Albert Decady can be reached on 571-272-3819. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Shewaye Gelagay SG
8/26/05

ALBERT DECADY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100